Approved For Release 2006/01/30 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300110042-7

The criticism is not applicable in this four county area, where Carolina Community Actions has been the administrative agency. CCA has made an excellent start in preparing some of our people for a more productive life. Education and counselling, to improve job skills and make the individual self-supporting, is the only effective approach to poverty. This is the OEO approach in this area.

Those who suggest that poverty can be eliminated by an appeal to individual responsibility are ill-informed on the poor, and on their problems. This is the old nonsense that being poor is the fault of the individual, rather than the result of his environment and lost opportunities. It is the philosophy of the dole of the 1930's, perpetuated by "give-aways" which provided just enough to keep the patient alive, but not enough to effect a cure.

OEO: A GOOD BEGINNING

Nationally, despite some mistakes and admitted inefficiencies, here is OEO's record: More than 3 million received individual health services; two million participated in Head Start; 300,000 received legal help; 23,000 participated in the Upward Bound (adult education) program; 800,000 young men and women participated in on-the-job training. The Job Corps—focal point of the critics—provided training to 109,000, of whom 59,000 are now working and 9,150 of whom are back in school.

The results OEO has achieved in this area, previously given wide publicity, are even more encouraging.

These are the demonstratable facts on OEO.

OEO's anti-poverty program is the one effort in three generations which seems to have a chance to bring young people to productive, tax-paying status. It would be misguided philosophy, indeed, to scuttle a self-help program in favor of continued "give-away" welfare subsistence.

Rep. Gettys has made the point that he had no representations made to him in favor of the OEO, except by those connected with the program. Since appropriations for the poverty war now are being debated in the House, with a showdown vote likely Thursday, this would be a good time for those who do favor OEO to let the Congressman know of their feelings. The OEO has been particularly helpful socially and economically to the Fifth District and it would be a shame should the District be hurt by any curtailment of the program.

Foster Grandparents Give, Receive Love

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 9, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I think the article in the Los Angeles Times entitled, "Retarded Youngsters' 'Foster Grandfolk' Give, Receive Love" will be of great interest to my colleagues.

The retarded children of the Pacific State Hospital in Pomona are receiving love in a unique manner. Under the OEO-funded foster grandparents program, 48 men and women 60 years and older are giving love to these children.

To qualify for the foster grandparent program, a person must be 60 years old or more, able to read and write, physically well, mentally alert, and have an annual income of no more than $1,500 if single or $2,000 if married.

The foster grandparents received $1.50 an hour. Their work is fulfilling and important. They read to the children, play games, take them to the canteen, rock them in their laps—in other words, they provided much needed love and attention.

The hospital staff feels that the program will benefit the children and prevent the misbehavior which frequently comes when retarded children receive too little personal care.

The children selected have the capacity to respond to enriched personal contact. In fact, 50 percent have a good chance of someday leaving the hospital altogether.

The elderly people involved are benefiting tremendously. They are people that need to have someone need them. One 60-year-old grandmother said, "We're just doing what comes naturally—giving love."

Mr. Speaker, this is but one of a number of marvelous innovations which OEO has made part of its community action program. I know my colleagues will be interested in the full text of the Times story, which follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Oct. 24, 1967]

RETARDED YOUNGSTERS' "FOSTER GRANDFOLK" GIVE, RECEIVE LOVE

(By Harry Nelson)

"We're just doing what comes naturally—loving children."

The 60-year-old grandmother who uttered those words meant what she said—she has eight children and 19 grandchildren at home.

But the children of whom she spoke are not her own. They are mentally retarded children with whom she and other "Foster Grandparents" spend four hours a day at Pacific State Hospital in Pomona.

A mutual interest in love, with the help of a novel antipoverty program, has brought the two together.

Mental retardation hasn't diminished in any way the children's need for love, according to the hospital staff.

But having 2,600 mentally retarded patients in one place spreads thin the love the staff can give.

So the state hospital and the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency of Los Angeles (EYOA) held meetings to see if they could come up with a way to use antipoverty funds to help solve the shortage of love.

The answer was Project Foster Grandparents. To qualify a person must be 60 years old or more, able to read and write, physically well, mentally alert and have an annual income of no more than $1,500 if single or $2,000 if married.

They receive $1.50 an hour and in exchange they read to the children, play games, take them to the canteen, rock them on their laps—in short act as a source of love.

The program will hire 48 foster grandparents to work with 388 youngsters over the next year. Applications should be made through the State Department of Employment, 105 East Arrow Highway, Pomona.

The seven grandfathers and 12 grandmothers already employed in the program have a total of 60 children, 156 grandchildren * * * nurse in charge of one ward that has 15 youngsters in the program, said she saw the potential for the program as soon as it was announced.

"The kids will do nearly anything they are capable of if they think grandpa or grandma wants them to do it," she said.

The project staff, headed by Steve Bromfield, said that children who have the capacity to respond to the enriched personal contact were selected for the children of their own.

"We need it as much as the children," says Mrs. Pearl Walker, 60, of Montclair. "I know I need somebody. I have a constant fear of being tied down behind four walls. Bosses won't hire women over 40.

"This is a windfall for me and it lets me do what comes naturally—love children."

Roscoe McGuire, 64, has four adopted grandchildren aged 8 to 12 at home in Pomona. Before retiring he worked at the hospital as an exterminator.

"I used to walk through the wards and I saw things then that made me want to come back," he said.

Mrs. Carrie Sanger, 61, of Upland said her husband died recently. "I was important to him, but all at once I wasn't needed any more. Now I'm needed again," she said.

Mrs. Betty Gifford, the * * * program. Most are under 10 years old. Some, perhaps 50%, stand a good chance of someday improving to the point where they can leave the hospital.

Most of the children have not been in the hospital long. It is hoped that the attention they will receive from the grandparents will prevent the kind of misbehavior common in hospitals because the children crave attention.

Attempts have been made in the past to get volunteers to do similar work, but the hospital has never been able to get enough for its needs.

"They could do remarkable things if they had a mother's attention," said one staff member.

Funds for the present program are available through the end of this year and it is expected that the program will continue through 1968.

The Fractional Orbital Bombardment System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 9, 1967

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary McNamara's sudden announcement that the Soviet Union may be testing an orbital bomb has prompted speculation as to the integrity of the Outer Space Treaty ratified only a month ago. If the Secretary has gone so far as to say the Russians "may" be testing such a weapon, past experience would indicate that indeed they are.

The fractional orbital bombardment system, as the Secretary calls it, is now the subject of considerable debate on whether or not it violates the treaty. Part of the discussion revolves around the meaning of the word "orbit." Secretary McNamara said that "They have agreed not to place warheads in full orbit," while Murrey Marder, writing in the Washington Post, speculates that the Russians might well be challenged on whether the term orbit applies to parts of a full orbit or not and noted that the State Department has sidestepped all questions about the legality of the Russian tests.

The Space Treaty used the word orbit in the following manner:

States Parties to the treaty undertake not to place in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

The word orbit is used in its noun form, and according to Webster's Dictionary is

Approved For Release 2006/01/30 : CIA-RDP70B00338R000300110042-7

defined as "a path described by one body or object in its revolution about another." To place an object "in orbit" then, is placing it "in" this path, and it does not require that it travel one complete revolution.

Perhaps each Nation has its own definition. Regretably there is no legal interpretation of the word available. To my mind, however, the Russians have not only violated the spirit of the agreement, but the word as well.

Administration officials testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concluded that there was no violation because a full orbit was not achieved and because there was no proof that a nuclear warhead was attached.

But Marder's column adds a most disturbing footnote:

> Once a warhead was attached . . . it could be a moot point whether the space treaty was violated, because the world could then be in the midst of World War III.

During debate on the treaty it was said that a philosophy of openness and broad applicability permeates the treaty. A statement prepared by the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee said:

> The policy of the treaty *may* deter some nations from attempting to acquire the technological capability to orbit weapons of mass destruction.

Let me emphasize that one word "may," because I think that characterizes the hope that underlies the treaty—the hope that the Soviets will not take advantage of this aggressive possibility—the hope that they will live up to the spirit of the declarations of the treaty—a hope that we should have known was merely self-delusion—a hope that has now been shattered.

When Senate ratification occurred last April, the American people were given the usual assurances that the treaty was a reliable guarantee against the hostile use of space. Leading the debate at that time was the senior Senator from my State, FRANK CHURCH.

Senator CHURCH recalled that both the Soviet Union and the United States had issued statements several years ago saying that "each would not station or otherwise place weapons of mass destruction in the orbit around the earth."

In the light of subsequent events, such statements are remarkable for their naivete.

Speaking of the "open access" provision by which one party to the treaty may insure that other states are complying, Senator CHURCH said:

> There are no comparable inspection provisions with respect to objects in orbit. The treaty, however, places no restriction on our right to observe. It guarantees freedom of access to all parts of space. Thus we must rely on our unilateral capability to monitor compliance by other parties. Our capability in this respect has been thoroughly reviewed by our very best military authorities. We have been clearly and forthrightly assured that we prefer to rely on our own monitoring capabilities and that we can do the job. I am, therefore, satisfied that our national security is in no way jeopardized by the lack of an inspection provision for orbiting objects.

To bolster his own conclusion, the Senator also offered this reassurance:

> The conclusion reached by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was that we can rely on our unilateral capabilities to monitor the no-bombs-in-orbit provision. The security of the United States will be fully preserved.

In view of such assurances, I was rather surprised to read an article in the November 7 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. The article discussed the impact of the orbital bomb on the current hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, saying:

> In view of the propect of new terror weapons cruising far overhead, administration witnesses will be pressed to thoroughly explore the rationale behind the nation's present strategic stance.
>
> Many persons, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, believe the administration should develop a heavy ABM defense to cope with Soviet strategic missiles.

Without going into the need for development of a heavy ABM system, I cannot help wondering about the relationship between this statement and the pleasant reassurances we were given last April.

If monitoring is so effective, why the sudden cry for building the heavy ABM system? Our experts in evaluating the tests must have come to some rather ominous conclusions.

The treaty provides in article XI that all parties shall "inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the nature, conduct, locations and results of activities in outer space."

So let us ask the United Nations to make inquiry under this provision as to the exact nature of these experiments and let the U.N. determine whether the Russian missile is in reality a weapon of mass destruction. Should the Russians refuse to cooperate, then the treaty will have served a useful purpose in holding up to the world the folly of negotiations with the Communists.

I have written to Ambassador Goldberg today requesting that he take the initial steps toward implementing this provision.

If there is a certain consistency in broken Russian agreements, it is counterbalanced by the series of paradoxes by which such acts are greeted in this country.

A few days ago, thousands demonstrated outside the Pentagon against American "warmongers." Where are the protesters now?

And those who deplored the decision to build a thin antiballistic missile system—where are the protesters now?

What a strange sight it has been to see the administration in effect defending the Russians in this matter. Secretary McNamara said, "I'm not concerned"—a rather startling statement from the man charged with the responsibility for defending the American people.

Those who negotiated the treaty knew that three tests occurred while talks were in progress. Six more took place between the time that the Senate ratified the treaty and its implementation October 10, and there have been two more since then.

Instead of reality, our country's leaders have fed us dreams. They want so badly to be friends with the enemy that they ignore the fact that it is Russian weapons which kill American boys in Vietnam. They wanted the treaty so badly that they were willing to ignore the fact that even as the Russians negotiated a peace-in-space agreement, they were testing a weapon of war in space. On such fond hopes is man's destruction built.

If a robber came up behind you and jabbed a gun in your back, you would not really know whether or not it was a gun. But it would be foolish to assume that it was not. By the same token, the fact that Russia has signed a piece of paper saying they will not put a nuclear warhead in space is hardly proof that they are not preparing to do just that. Based upon the evidence and on our past experience with the Communists of bad faith and broken treaties, we had better take whatever steps are necessary to counter this threat.

Government-Financed Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 9, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the American Library Association is concerned about recent revelations regarding Government-financed books.

The association has adopted the following statement:

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE ALA COUNCIL, THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, AT THE ASSOCIATION'S 86TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 30, 1967

At San Francisco, during the 86th Annual Conference of the ALA, the Association expressed its conviction that the cause of democracy is best served when the operations of government are fully revealed. In the sensitive area of public opinion, secret influence can only contaminate truth and corrupt the fundamental concepts of free speech and a free press.

The American Library Association takes note of the fact that, during the second session of the 89th Congress at a hearing before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, the United States Information Agency revealed under questioning that it had been subsidizing and otherwise encouraging authors to write, and publishers to print, materials useful to and harmonious with Agency programs of information to foreign readers. It was further revealed that many of these publications were also sold commercially without any disclosure to the reader of the source of the subsidy or other form of encouragement.

Subsequently, on February 9, 1967, the Assistant Director of the United States Information Agency indicated that no manuscript would be commissioned without the approval of the Director.

However, almost at the same time, and from another direction, public revelations were made of covert activities by the Central Intelligence Agency with respect to private, non-governmental organizations, in which public moneys were employed to develop and influence opinions and actions consonant with governmental objectives.

The American Library Association expresses the concern of its members that disclosure of the sources of influence and subsidies in the forging of public opinion has